

# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW S.F.T.S LIBRARY



## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| THE NEW COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL ..                                       | 33   |
| By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, S.A. |      |
| THE INDEPENDENTS: DECENTRALISED CALVINISM IN 17th CENTURY ENGLAND ..             | 38   |
| By the Rev. George Yule, M.A., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.          |      |
| BOOK REVIEWS ..  | 50   |
| (See list on inside of back cover.)  |      |

PRICE: TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

## EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A.,  
Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.  
THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.  
THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.  
THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.  
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D.,  
Sydney.  
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D.,  
Dunedin.  
THE REV. PROFESSOR D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.,  
Ph.D., Melbourne.  
THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil.,  
Sydney.  
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.,  
Sydney.  
THE REV. ALLAN MacKILLOP, B.A., B.D., Brisbane.  
THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.  
THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne.  
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed.,  
Brisbane.

---

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in  
the exposition of the Christian Faith.  
The Editors are not responsible for  
every opinion that may be expressed.

---

## ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

---

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded  
to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn,  
Melbourne, E.2. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward  
their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O.  
Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:  
Seven Shillings and Sixpence (Foreign, 8/-), post free.



# THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XV, No. 2

JUNE, 1956

## The New Commentary on St. John's Gospel\*

The problem of the Fourth Gospel seemed for long to be the supreme battleground between conservative orthodoxy, represented above all in the English speaking world by Westcott's great commentary, and the 'liberal criticism' which united a denial of apostolic authorship with a 'reduced Christology' and a humanitarian and ethical interpretation of the teaching of our Lord. It was 'one of the main aims' of *The Riddle of the New Testament* by Hoskyns and Davey (1931) to show that 'the battleground lies elsewhere.'<sup>(1)</sup>

In the last fifteen years we have had three important books on this gospel which have combined a firm traditional orthodoxy with a radically critical treatment of the authorship and the allied problems: Hoskyns' posthumous book (1940), Dodd's *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953), and now this book by Barrett, which was complete before Dodd's book was published, so that his references to Dr. Dodd are dependent on occasional articles chiefly. It will no doubt have been the experience of others who have been lecturing on St. John throughout this period, as it certainly has been mine, that the quality of their students' essays showed a most remarkable improvement when Hoskyns' book appeared. It is a mighty and a prophetic work, setting the gospel firmly on its biblical and Hebraic basis; perhaps its chief fault is that it nowhere sets out and discusses the evidence with regard to the authorship. Dodd, in his turn, compelled us to face the Hellenistic character of the gospel; the parallels from the Hermetic literature and Philo were set out, and there was even the thesis that it was written primarily with pagan readers in mind, to be their first introduction to the Christian faith. Most of us found this impossible to accept: as Barrett says (p. 115), 'the profundity of the gospel is such that it seems

\*The Gospel according to St. John. An introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text. By C. K. Barrett (S.P.C.K., London), 1955, pp. 531; 63/-.  
1. See *The Riddle* p. 281-2 (first edition).

very doubtful whether anyone who had not a good grounding in the gospel tradition and elementary Christian theology would appreciate it.' Was it perhaps written rather for Christian converts who had had a pagan Greek education?

Barrett's book sets out to do justice to both sides, the Hebraic and the Hellenistic. He gives us a very full Introduction, with the whole problem of the authorship set out. He agrees with Hoskyns and disagrees with Dodd in holding that the detailed comparison of this gospel with the synoptists, and especially with Mark, is of decisive importance. But while his commentary is always detailed and learned, it is not always satisfying; and he falls short of both his predecessors in the drawing out of the meaning of the episodes of which the gospel is composed.

But his Introduction is quite superb; perhaps we have never had anything so good about the Fourth Gospel. He deals first with the characteristics of the gospel, literary and linguistic, and the various theories of dislocation of the order; he dismisses them all as unproven and as raising more difficulties than they solve. He goes on to the background in the Old Testament and in Judaism and in Greek philosophy and the mystery-religions; and then to the New Testament background. Why does St. John not relate the Virgin-birth of Jesus, his baptism and temptation, his transfiguration, the eucharistic institution, the agony in the garden? It is not that he rejects any of these as unhistorical; far from it. 'It is unthinkable that he dismissed such incidents as unimportant; in fact, it seems that he regarded them as far more important than mere "incidents" (p. 42). Thus, for instance, 'the Matthean and Lukan narratives of the Virgin-birth of Jesus, widely as they differ, agree in asserting the uniqueness of Jesus, the fact that he was the Son of God, in all things dependent upon and obedient to the Father's will, and the consequent truth that his entry into this world marked the beginning of God's new creation. That each of these theses is central in the fourth gospel is so manifest that documentation is unnecessary.' Yet the narratives could be taken as having 'unfortunate contacts with discreditable pagan mythology. Later, Justin and other apologists were to use these contacts in support of the credibility of the Christian story; but John, who came to his work with a far more biblical mind than they, cannot have found them so congenial' (p. 43). From the consideration of the synoptic gospels we come to that of St. Paul; here there is a deep substantial agree-



ment in the faith which all Christians believed, but not as it seems direct dependence. Neither the Johannine epistles nor the Apocalypse are likely to have been written by the fourth evangelist (pp. 49-52).

Next we come to his quite admirable treatment of the theology of the fourth gospel. Eschatology first: this is a central problem for the Christian theologian, summed up in St. John's phrase, 'the hour is coming, and now is.' 'In Christ the new age had come, but had done so in such a way that it still remained to come, so that Christians live both in this age and in the age to come' (p. 57). Thus the eschatological element in the fourth gospel is not accidental, but is fundamental to it. Later on, he speaks of the problem which had to be met, about the delay of the *parousia*. 'The extension of the interim in time . . . was not merely something to be patiently endured; it must have a positive meaning in the purpose of God' (p. 116). 'That Christianity was able . . . to maintain its unique and authentic tension of realization and hope, was due in no small measure to John's contribution to eschatological thought' (*ib.*). With regard to the miracles, 'John has seized the Christological interpretation of them which is implicit in the synoptics, clarified it, and stamped it upon the material so that we are not allowed to escape it' (p. 62). And here is a comment on John 5:16-18: 'The fact that the Father rested on the seventh day and hallowed it did not mean that on that day he ceased to be what he had been hitherto, a beneficent Creator. On the contrary, the completion of God's work which it signified made it possible to use the Sabbath as a type of the messianic rest reserved for the people of God, a time of blessing for men introduced not by the cessation of God's activity but by an unprecedented outflowing of his creative power' (p. 65), in the miracles of Jesus. 'The miracles show figuratively what salvation is — the curing of the sick, the feeding of the hungry, the giving of sight to the blind, the raising of the dead. Salvation, that is, means the healing of the ills of mankind, and the imparting of light and life. . . . These aspects of salvation are seen from time to time in the course of the gospel, but appear pre-eminently in the death and resurrection of Jesus' (p. 67).

Here we must reluctantly leave the section on the theology of the gospel, and pass on to the problems of its authorship and provenance and early attestation. As regards the last of these, we are left with a maze of unanswered questions, which are all patiently described and

dealt with. From St. Irenaeus onwards, this gospel is fully accepted in the Church, as the work of the apostle John; before this, all is uncertain. Did Polycarp, did Papias, know the gospel? It does not appear so. 'John the Elder' is a misty figure, and is not the evangelist. The de Boor fragment is unreliable. As for allusions and quotations: St. Ignatius says sometimes things which sound Johannine; Justin Martyr seems to quote the gospel but does not quote it as the work of an Apostle. Theophilus of Antioch is the first to name the evangelist as 'John,' c 180 AD. In fact, the gospel 'was first seized upon by gnostic speculators, who saw the superficial contact which existed between it and their own work; they at least could recognize the language which John spoke. Only gradually did the main body of the Church come to perceive that while John used (at times) the language of gnosticism his work was in fact the strongest possible reply to the gnostic challenge; that he had beaten the gnostics with their own weapons, and vindicated the permanent validity of the primitive Gospel' (p. 112).

The crux of the problem of the origin of John lies in (i) the moral certainty that the gospel was not written by John the son of Zebedee' (how could one brought up as a Galilean fisherman have written such a book, and have had so profound an understanding of Hellenistic thought?) and '(ii) the probability that the tradition (which seems to begin as early as 21.24) that the gospel was written by John the son of Zebedee, interested as it doubtless was, was not pure fiction but had some foundation' (p. 112). Who is the Beloved Disciple? Probably the son of Zebedee; if not, he is altogether unidentifiable. (The probability is increased, if we think that more value should be allowed than is allowed here to certain historical facts related of him.) It is on the basis that he is the son of Zebedee that a suggestion is made which is mentioned in every review of this book, but which must not be treated as a 'theory,' because it is put forward 'in the hope that its refutation may be a more profitable exercise than its construction' (p. 113). It is that the 'Son of Thunder' lived to a great age, having written some apocalyptic prophecies during Nero's reign, parts of which are preserved in the Apocalypse. 'A man of commanding influence, he gathered about him a number of pupils.' One of these wrote the Apocalypse; another, perhaps two others, gave us the Epistles; 'yet another, a bolder thinker, and one more widely read both in Judaism and Hellenism, produced



John 1-20.' We are asked for comments; this might be ventured. What might have been the personal relation between the pupil and his apostolic teacher? Did he regard him with profound veneration, and feel that from him he had learnt all that he knew about the Lord and his Gospel? Was there for him a magic about the name John, so that in the Prologue when he mentions John the Baptist he does so in words that would apply in substance to the Apostle sent (*apostalmenos*) not as himself the light, but to bear witness of that Light. May this help to account for the way in which the evangelist conceals his own identity?

Finally, we come to the all-important question of this gospel's authority (pp. 118-119). Already we have had on p. 101, with reference to the baffling problems of the internal evidence: 'What does emerge from the evidence is, not that the gospel as it stands is a first-hand historical document, but that those responsible for it were seriously concerned about the meaning and authority of the apostolic witness to the history of Jesus.' And now he says: In the view of the gnostics, authority rested with the natural *elite* among Christians, those who had the charisma of theosophical speculation; but this meant no authority at all. Because of this need for authority, the Church in the second century drew up the New Testament canon; it also formulated more clearly the essentials of its faith; and it recognized in a permanent Ministry a guardianship of the apostolic tradition. 'John did nothing to further any of these lines of development. Instead, he asked, and causes his readers to ask, What was the nature of the authority of the apostles themselves? And the answer to this question follows two lines' (p. 118). 'First, the authority of the apostles lies in their ability to bear witness to the gospel history. On this, for all his freedom with the details of history, John insists most strongly.' 'Second, the authority of the apostles rests on the commission given to them by Jesus,' most clearly in 20.21; and with this goes the mission of the Holy Spirit 'whom the Father will send in my name' (14.26). 'We reach here the point of transition from the apostles and their authority to the authority . . . which was in fact perpetuated in the life of the Church itself.' 'The Church is the Church — the authoritative, apostolic Church — so far as it rests upon the word of the apostles (17.20), and is obedient to the Spirit, who takes the things of Christ and applies them to generation after generation of Christians.'

These are the concluding words of this great Introduction.

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

## The Independents

### *Decentralised Calvinism in 17th Century England*

Independency has played a remarkable role in the religious and secular history of England. It has greatly influenced ecclesiastical life for three centuries. In politics, the only republican era in English history was dominated by Independents, while in the late nineteenth century it had tremendous influence in the Liberal Party.<sup>(1)</sup>

But who were the Independents? It is assumed that they were the direct and only ancestors of the modern Congregationalists, to their admirers the fathers of toleration and to their enemies the fathers of theological liberalism. Church historians have argued endlessly about their precise origins — was Robert Browne the real founder of the Separatists ideal, or do we have to go back to the shadowy figure of Richard Fitz, who was apprehended with his little group of Separatists and committed to the Bridewell in 1571? But if Browne (or Richard Fitz as the ancestor of the Brownists) was the father of the Independents, it is surprising that the Independents of the Civil War period rejected the name of Brownist with vigour, and all their more perceptive contemporaries agreed that they were right in so doing. And if they were just the party of toleration, it is hard to account for their fellow Independents in New England persecuting with a more remorseless logic than any other part of the Reformed Church. Clearly the usual answers to the problem will not do, and in order to arrive at any kind of a solution we must look at the history of the Reformed Church in England.

Calvin, replying to the attack of Cardinal Sadolet, said that what the Reformers were doing was attempting "to renew the ancient form of the Church."<sup>(2)</sup> But what form was the government of the Church to take? This problem occupied the English Reformers for over a century.

In England the Reformers, particularly with the help of Martin Bucer, made much progress in England during the reign of Edward VI, but Mary's accession naturally wrecked their efforts and a very great number fled to the Continent. Many settled in Geneva itself, and naturally became, if they were not already, ardent Calvinists. On Mary's death, the Reformers in exile hurried home to England to the task of thoroughly reforming the Church.

---

1. I am informed that in Manchester circa 1890, 92% of office-bearers in Congregational churches were active members of the Liberal Party.  
 2. Reprinted in *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (S.C.M.) p 231.



For the Calvinists, the Church had to be Reformed according to the Word of God; Catholic, for, as Calvin stated so clearly, the purpose of Christ's coming was "to collect us all into one body from that dispersion in which we are now wandering";<sup>(3)</sup> independent of State control, for Christ was the only King and Head of the Church;<sup>(4)</sup> yet it was to permeate the whole of life for there was to be no withdrawing from the world, as God was sovereign over both spheres of Nature and of Grace, and Christ had restored the whole universe by his Resurrection.<sup>(5)</sup>

But Elizabeth had got in first, and her model of a state-controlled Church was far removed from the Calvinist ideal. What were the Calvinists to do? Were they to leave the Church of England in the interests of reform, or were they to remain within it in the interests of catholicity? Most leading Calvinists urged the latter course, but many thought the Anglican Church so ill-reformed that it was no true branch of the Church, and in the interests of reform tended not to co-operate with it. Calvin was divided against Calvin. Those who remained within the Church tried every means to further its reformation. Strong pressure was applied through a Puritan group in Parliament,<sup>(6)</sup> Calvinist preachers were as bold as they dared,<sup>(7)</sup> and pamphleteers kept up a strong but ineffective running warfare. Elizabeth very cunningly made the issue appear to be merely one of vestments — and why raise such a fuss about that?<sup>(8)</sup> Of course the real issue was whether the Church was independent of State control. The Elizabethan Presbyterians then embarked on their most daring scheme. They tried to organise a Presbyterian system and discipline unobtrusively within the Church of England and to do it legally. Presbyteries were in fact set up in a number of counties, and plans were begun for the holding of a General Assembly,<sup>(9)</sup> but after the defeat of the Armada, when the government could afford to attend to these Puritans, its leaders were apprehended and the movement brought to a close. Thereafter its members remained rather uneasily within the Established Church. From then on, for

3. *Commentary on Hebrews* 10.25. I am deeply indebted to Professor T. F. Torrance for drawing my attention to the importance of this commentary.

4. This was one of Whitgift's chief charges against the Elizabethan Calvinists. See Strype, *Whitgift*, iii. 235.

5. Calvin, *Commentary on Hebrews* 2.6 ff.

6. J. E. Neale, *The Parliaments of Elizabeth*.

7. Though if too bold they were banished, e.g. Cartwright.

8. Calvin in his reply to Sadolet had said that ceremonies and vestments were minor matters, and this was the attitude of Knox to this vestarian controversy.

9. See R. G. Usher, *The Presbyterian Movement*, (Camden Society Publications 1905).

most of these Puritans, Church government ceased to be an important issue, and their Puritanism took on a much more exclusively ethical attitude — strict morality, especially sabbatarianism, and the abolition of ceremonialism in the liturgy.<sup>(10)</sup>

Whereas the Presbyterian Puritans remained within the Church of England, others who thought it too ill-reformed to be a true branch of the Catholic Church separated from it. Some were non-Calvinist in outlook, but in 1579 Robert Browne, a Calvinist by inclination, seceded from the Church of England and formed a Separatist congregation. In other respects his theology was in the Reformed tradition, but he himself probably,<sup>(11)</sup> and his associate, Barrowe, certainly, developed a complete theology of Separatism. Church and State were regarded as completely separate. They would have nothing whatsoever to do with the Church of England — “that synagogue of Satan” whose “deans and prebends are the Frogs and Locusts mentioned in the Revelation” and none of their “bishops but have a Pope in their bellies.”<sup>(12)</sup>

These Separatist churches persisted, despite persecution, till the Civil War. Some like the Brownists were in the Calvinist tradition; others were Baptist, and others mystical sects like the Family of Love, but they shared three things in common — a hatred of the Church of England and refusal to attend its services, a doctrine of complete separation of Church and State, and therefore a demand for religious toleration and the abolition of tithes.

It is generally argued that the Independents were simply in this tradition. Indeed, many of their contemporary enemies referred to them as Brownists, although the more perspicacious saw that they were not. Baillie, the Scots Commissioner for the Westminster Assembly, Clarendon and Baxter<sup>(13)</sup> for example, clearly distinguish them from the Brownists and other sectaries, while Separatists, like the Baptist Roger Williams, were very emphatic on the point.<sup>(14)</sup>

10. This is hard to prove conclusively but is, I am certain, a fact. See, e.g. *Reliquae Baxterianae* 1.3, where Baxter says his father was a strict Puritan but neither he nor his father were in the least concerned with church government.

11. This difficult point is discussed by C. Burrage, *Early English Dissenters* 1.105.

12. The words of later Barrowists, Greene and Spencer. Quoted in C. Burrage, *op. cit.* 1.207.

13. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, ii.299.

Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, X § 162.

Baxter, *Reliquae*. 1.140.

14. *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*. Quoted in A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty*, p 287.



They themselves were quite explicit. We are, said Nye and Thomas Goodwin, for "that very middle way . . . between that which is called Brownism and the Presbyterian Government as it is practised."<sup>(15)</sup> What did they mean by this "very middle way"? In their manifesto of 1643 *The Apologetical Narration* four leading Independents, Nye, Thomas Goodwin, Burroughs and Bridge, maintained that it "was a most abhorred maxim" that "a single and particular society of men, professing the name of Christ, and pretending to be endowed with a power from Christ to judge them that are of the same body and society within themselves, should further arrogate unto themselves an exemption from giving account to or being censurable by any other, either Christian magistrates above them or neighbour churches about them."<sup>(16)</sup>

The aim of the Independents was a new form of Church organisation, a form of decentralised Calvinism, or as the Presbyterian Bastwick put it, they wanted, not Presbyterian dependent, but Presbyterianism independent<sup>(17)</sup> In the small city state of Geneva, the question of how reformed congregations should be connected did not arise in an acute form, but when the reformed faith spread to the nation states, it became a vital issue. The form of organisation that generally developed was Presbyterianism, in which the local congregations were grouped together in Presbyteries, the presbyters together forming a kind of corporate episcopacy. The Independents, however, placed the supreme power in the local congregations, and not in the Presbyteries or a General Assembly of presbyters. These bodies, they said, should exist solely to give mutual help and advice. As Baillie expressed their position in 1646:—

"It hath hitherto been their earnest desire to decline the infamy of Brownism, and it was charity of their Brethren to distinguish them from that sect under the new name of Independents, importing their chief difference from us to stand not in the point of Separation, which is our proper quarrel with the Brownists, but alone in the point of Church government, which, against all the Reformed Churches, they maintain to be Independent, that is, not subject to the authority and jurisdiction of any superior synod."<sup>(18)</sup>

This central Independent idea on Church government was set out at the Savoy Conference of 1658 when the Independents came together to draw up a doctrinal state-

15. Introduction to John Cotton's *The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*. In Woodhouse, *op.cit.* p 296.

16. In Hanbury, *Historical Memorials of the Independents*, ii. 227.

17. Bastwick, *Independency not God's Ordinance* (1645) pp 5-7.

18. Baillie, *Dissuasive from the Errors of Our Time*, p. 102.

ment.<sup>(19)</sup> Christ the only King and Head of the Church calls certain people to walk together in particular societies, and "to each of these churches. . . . He hath given all that power and authority which is in any way needful for the carrying on that order in worship and discipline. . . . Besides these particular churches there is not instituted by Christ any church more extensive or catholic. . . ." <sup>(20)</sup>

What differentiated this system from Brownism?

In the first place, the government of the Churches was in the hands of the elders and not of the whole congregation, which according to Nye and Thomas Goodwin, would "drown the elders' votes," <sup>(21)</sup> but more importantly, they differed in their attitude to the State and consequently to the State Church. Unlike the Brownists, they did not want to separate Church and State, and there was a definite place in their doctrine for a national Church, even for the unreformed Church of England. They were undoubtedly strongly attracted by the ideal of purity of the Brownist and other Separatist congregations, but unlike them, they did not want the separation of Church and State. In this they are quite clearly in the main tradition of the medieval Church — and of Calvin.

The real founder of this Independent ideal was not Browne but Henry Jacob, who set up an Independent congregation in London in 1616.<sup>(22)</sup> Jacob was one of the Puritan leaders who drew up the *Millenary Petition* urging James I to reform the Church of England. He was not a separatist, though he had correspondence with Francis Johnson the Barrowist who was then in prison.<sup>(23)</sup> This correspondence and the failure of the Hampton Court Conference moved Jacob to a more radical position. In 1605 he drew up a document requesting the right "to assemble together somewhat publicly to the Service and Worship of God, to use and enjoy peaceably among ourselves alone the whole exercise of God's worship and of Church government, viz., by a Pastor, Elder and Deacons in our several Assemblies without any tradition of men whatsoever, according only to the specification of God's written word and no otherwise, which hitherto as yet in this present state we could not enjoy."<sup>(24)</sup> This would seem to be the same type of demand that a Separatist group might make, but Jacob added certain significant clauses —

19. *The Savoy Declaration*, in Hanbury, op. cit. pp 532ff.

20. *ibid.* p 545.

21. Woodhouse, op. cit. p 296.

22. This is very well brought out by C. Burrage, op. cit. vol I. chap. xii.

23. *ibid.* p 282.

24. Quoted in *ibid.* p 286.



"Provided always that whosoever will enter into this way shall before a Justice of the Peace, first take the oath of your majesty's supremacy and royal authority as the laws of the land at this present do set forth the same; and shall also afterwards keep brotherly communion with the rest of our English Churches as they are now established, according as the French and Dutch Churches do; and shall truly pay all payments and duties both ecclesiastical and civil as at this present they stand bound to pay in any respect whatsoever; and if any trespass be committed by any of them whether ecclesiastically or civilly against good order and Christian obedience, that then the same person shall be dealt withal therein by any of your Majesty's Civil Magistrates and by the same ecclesiastical government only whereunto he ordinarily joineth himself according as to justice appertaineth, and not to be molested by any other whomsoever."<sup>(25)</sup>

That is, the royal supremacy that extended to ecclesiastical affairs was in some unspecified sense recognised, as was the validity of the established Church, the paying of tithes and the right of the magistrates to interfere in matters of religion to some extent. But the true Church, Jacob maintained, was to be organised, like the Brownists, "by a free mutual consent of believers joining and covenanting to live as members of a holy Society. . . ."<sup>(26)</sup> The specifically "Independent" nature of the Church organisation was set out by Jacob's associate, William Bradshaw, in his pamphlet *English Puritanism*.

"They hold that Christ Jesus hath not subjected any Church or Congregation of His to any other superior Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction than unto that which is within itself, so that if a whole Church or congregation should err, in any matter of faith or religion, no other Churches or Spiritual Church officers have (by any warrant from the word of God) power to censure, punish or control the same: but are only to counsel and advise the same, and so to leave their Souls to the immediate Judgment of Christ and their bodies to the sword and power of the Civil Magistrate, who alone upon earth hath power to punish a whole Church or Congregation."<sup>(27)</sup>

The power of Bishops and even Church Assemblies was to be abolished. The national Church was to be kept intact by the Civil Magistrate.

This was the theoretical position of Independency. In 1616 after 10 years in exile in Holland, Jacob began to practise it. He gathered a congregation in London and published a confession of faith, in which his congregation hoped to clear itself of the slander of "Schism and Novelty, and also of Separation and undutifulness to the Magistrate."<sup>(28)</sup> That they were not Separatists is shown by the

25. *ibid.*

26. *op. cit.* p 287.

27. *op. cit.* p 288.

28. *op. cit.* p 315.

fact that the remnants of Barrow's congregation in London regarded "Mr. Jacob's people" as "Idolators in their going to the parish assemblies."<sup>(29)</sup>

This was the type of position that was adopted by John Robinson and the Pilgrim Fathers. Robinson was for many years a Separatist, but by 1618 his attitude was Independent.<sup>(29a)</sup> In his work published in 1634, *On the Lawfulness of hearing of Ministers of the Church of England*, he concluded:—

"For myself, this I believe with my heart before God, and profess with my tongue and have, before the world: That I have one and the same Faith, Hope, Spirit, Baptism and Lord which I had in the Church of England and none other. That I esteem so many in that Church of what state or order soever, as are truly partakers of that Faith—as I account many Thousands to be—for my Christian brethren, and myself a fellow member with them of that mystical Body of Christ scattered far and wide throughout the world . . . That I am persuaded the Hearing of the Word of God there preached . . . is both lawful, and upon just occasion necessary for me and for all true Christians withdrawing from the Hierarchical Order of church government and ministry and the appurtenances thereof."<sup>(30)</sup>

And in that "happy bishopless Eden" of New England, the Independents did in fact set up their ideal of a national Church composed of independent congregations. Church and State there formed one Holy—and singularly intolerant—community. Indeed, so repressive was it that as a protest the Baptist Roger Williams formulated the classical treatise on the theology of Separatism, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*.

"The church or company of worshippers, whether true or false, is like unto a body or college of physicians in a city, like unto a corporation, society or company of East India or Turkey merchants or any other society or company in London; which companies may hold their courts, keep their records, hold disputations and in matters concerning their society may dissent, divide, break into schisms and factions, sue and implead each other at the law, yea, wholly break up and dissolve into pieces and nothing, and yet the peace of the city not in the least measure impaired or disturbed; because the essence or being of the city, and so the wellbeing and peace thereof is essentially distinct from those particular societies,"<sup>(31)</sup>

How very different is this from Calvin's thought, where Church and State were both aspects of the one Kingdom of Christ.<sup>(32)</sup> It was Calvin's doctrine on the subject to which the leading English Independents held and expounded

29. op. cit. p 314.

29a. op. cit. p 291 ff.

30. Quoted in Hanbury, op. cit. i.459.

31. In Woodhouse, op. cit. p 267.

32. Institutes IV—XX—2-3.



with such clarity in *The Ancient Bounds* of 1645.<sup>(33)</sup> After urging the necessity for toleration among Christians, partly as their right and partly as the best way of arriving at the truth, they went on to say:—

“Christ Jesus, whose is the kingdom, the power and the glory both in nature and in grace, hath given several maps and schemes of his dominions . . . both of his great kingdom the world, . . . and of his special and peculiar kingdom, the kingdom of grace. Which kingdoms, though they differ essentially or formally, yet they agree in one common subject matter, man, and societies of men though under a diverse consideration. And not only man in society but every man individually is an epitome, either of one only or of both these dominions. . . .”

The authors then went on to discuss the place of civil authority in the sphere of nature. “All vicious and scandalous practices contrary to the light of nature or manifest good of societies” must be prevented. “Scruple of conscience cannot exempt a man from any civil duty he owes to the state. . . . And though God can have no glory by a forced religion, yet the state may have benefit by a forced service.”<sup>(34)</sup> This sentence gives the clue to the difference between the English Independents and the Presbyterians. The Independents wanted toleration in the sphere of Grace, but not in the sphere of Nature. Therefore men must not be coerced in matters of religion, for God could not thereby be glorified. The difference was only one of degree (though it was in actual fact a very large degree), for the authors went on to show that as Calvin had urged<sup>(35)</sup> the “magistrates do prepare by a good government for the gospel,” for (quoting Chrysostom) “good princes make virtue, while they both urge it by their example, and drive men to it by fear of punishments.” They continued:

“Thus we have committed to the magistrate the charge of the Second Table, viz., materially that is, he is not to see God dishonoured by the manifest breach thereof, or any part thereof. But is that all? No, surely. He may enter the vault even of those abominations of the First Table, and ferret the devils and devil-worship out of their holes and dens, so far as nature carries the candle before him. Therefore it seems to me that polytheism and atheistical doctrines (which are sins against the First Table and First Commandment) and idolatry (which is against the Second Commandment) such as may be convinced by natural light, or by the letter of the command where the scriptures are received as the worshipping of images and the breaden-god, the grossest idolatry of all—these so far forth as they break out and discover themselves, ought to be restrained and exploded by the Christian magistrate.”<sup>(36)</sup>

33. In Woodhouse, op. cit. pp 247 ff.

34. *Ibid.* p 248.

35. *Institutes*, loc. cit.

36. In Woodhouse, op. cit. pp 247 ff.

Quite clearly here there is no separation of Church and State and no absolute toleration as such a separation entails. This divides the Independents from the Separatists. On the other hand, they want more toleration in the sphere of Grace than the Presbyterians would allow because they wanted each congregation to be autonomous, and permitted to exist and to go its own way, provided that it held the substance of the Gospel. Whereas the Separatists wanted toleration in civil life, with discipline, if any, only in the sphere of Grace, the Independents frequently had a far larger measure of toleration in the sphere of Grace, but did not want toleration in the sphere of Nature.<sup>(37)</sup> They differed with the Presbyterians over Church organisation primarily, but this dispute in England led to differences developing over the question of toleration, and who should enforce discipline, Church or State.

For whereas in Massachusetts the Independents were supreme, in England they were not. In the Westminster Assembly their following was less than twenty; in the House of Lords they could count on the consistent support of only two peers; in the Commons support was stronger (about forty per cent. of its membership) though I think possibly for other than religious reasons.

When the Civil War broke out, Pym, the parliamentary leader, tried to shelve the difficult religious question. When it did come to the fore at the Root and Branch Petition in 1642, nobody advocated replacing episcopacy by either Presbyterianism or Independency, and the Church was actually ruled by a committee of the House of Commons.<sup>(38)</sup> But after many military defeats, Parliament called in the aid of the Scots, who refused to come except on condition of a religious alliance, i.e., the establishment of Presbyterianism in both kingdoms. By then the war party in Parliament, who wanted the Scots alliance, was controlled by Sir Henry Vane, an Independent, recently returned from Massachusetts, who did not want Presbyterianism. By a series of manoeuvres, he and the Independent divines in the Westminster Assembly delayed the implementation of Presbyterianism until, by the trick of the Self-Denying Ordinance, the Independents gained control of the Army under Oliver Cromwell, who was religiously more tolerant than most of the Independents. From the end of the First

37. Many Separatists were most intolerant in the sphere of Grace, e.g. Roger Kennet in London 1641, limited salvation to members of his own congregation. *The Brownist Synagogue* quoted Burrage, op. cit. i. 206.

38. W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil War*, Vol I gives an excellent account of this debate and its result.



Civil War until December 6, 1648, a bitter struggle for power continued between the Independents dominating the Army and the Presbyterians dominating Parliament.<sup>(39)</sup> To gain support, the Independents frequently allied with the Levellers, radical democrats of the Army and London, who were religiously Separatists and ardent upholders of toleration. "In matters of religion," declared their spokesman, Overton, toleration is "preferred by us before life. Let's have that or nothing."<sup>(40)</sup> This forced many Independents, especially those in the Army, to a more radical religious position. But the Erastian Presbyterian majority in Parliament eventually agreed to the recommendation of the Westminster Assembly to set up a Presbyterian form of Church government. It was, in fact, only implemented in a few parts of the country, but it is significant that many Independent laymen and some Independent ministers actively supported the Established Presbyterian Church. For example, over thirty members of Parliament who were active supporters of the political Independents were Presbyterian elders,<sup>(41)</sup> while William Strong, minister of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, London, and John Philips, minister of Wrentham, Suffolk, both Independents, were members of presbyteries.<sup>(42)</sup> Strong became minister of Westminster Abbey when it was an Independent church under the Commonwealth;<sup>(43)</sup> Philips had been persecuted by Laud, was in exile with Hugh Peters, a leading Independent divine, but with his patron, Robert Brewster, the Independent member of Parliament, was a member of the Suffolk presbytery. But as soon as the Independents seized power after Pride's Purge, December 6, 1648, and Presbyterianism ceased to be in any real sense the established Church, they organised Wrentham parish church along classical Independent lines.<sup>(44)</sup> This example is instructive: Philips and Brewster were genuine Independents, yet they supported the Presbyterian Church, but only when it was the Established Church. Independency had the type of Church organisation of the Brownists, but a strong connection between Church and State like the Presbyterians. When they could not have their ideal, a national Church composed of Independent congregations, they preferred the

---

39. I have discussed this more fully in a forthcoming book.

40. In the Whitehall Debate. Reprinted in Woodhouse, *op. cit.* p. 139.

41. J. H. Hexter, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents" in *American Historical Review* 1938.

42. W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil War*, Vol. 2, pp 404 and 425.

43. Ira Brosely, *The Ministers of the Abbey Independent Church*.

44. J. Browne, *Congregational Churches of Norfolk and Suffolk*. see Index under Wrentham.

preservation of a national Church with Presbyterianism to the independent organisation of the Church with Separatism. During the Commonwealth and Protectorate, at least a hundred, and probably far more, Independents continued to act as ministers in parish churches.<sup>(45)</sup> Though they wanted each church to be autonomous, though they wanted a high measure of religious toleration, they were still sufficiently influenced by the Church-type tradition of the Reformers to reject the complete separation of the spheres of Nature and Grace. On December 14, 1648, just after they had come to power, they rejected the ardent pleas of their temporary allies, the Levellers, for complete separation of Church and State in the interests of toleration. The Independent dilemma was stated by Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law. "The question is now whether you shall make such a provision for men that are conscientious in order that they may serve God according to their light and conscience, as necessarily debars any kind of restraint on anything that any man will call religion."<sup>(46)</sup> In debate with the Levellers, the Independents used three arguments to show that State and Church are connected, the most interesting of which is their argument from the Old Testament. The Separatists claimed that Israel was a pattern for the Church only. John Goodwin (here siding with Collier, the Baptist, and other Separatists against the classical Independents) argued, "Canaan was typical of Churches and typical of the Churches of Christ under the Gospel of the purity of them and of the holiness of them."<sup>(47)</sup> and therefore one could not deduce the way a magistrate should act from the model of Israel. The Independents claimed that Israel was God's pattern for Christian states. Ireton said that the Jewish magistrates punished idolatry, swearers and other breakers of religious laws "as civil magistrates or magistrates having an authority civil or natural, and not as ecclesiastical magistrates or as persons signifying or typifying the power of ecclesiastical officers under the Gospel."<sup>(48)</sup>

The Independent ideal was never set up in England, though I think there is evidence that Cromwell was moving in that direction for a few weeks before his death he had

---

45. I am indebted to Dr. G. U. Nuttal for his list of Congregational incumbents under the Commonwealth. It is difficult sometimes to identify the Independent ministers. After going through A. G. Mathew's *Calamy Revised*, I think that they might have been as many as 500 Independent ministers who were also ministers of Parish churches.

46. The Whitehall Debate. Woodhouse, *op. cit.* p 143.

47. *op. cit.* p 158.

48. *op. cit.* p 156.



issued an order for the Independents to draw up a confession of faith, which they did at the Savoy Conference. But meanwhile, Cromwell had died, and without him — the godly magistrate — their ideal was impossible. The Confession, however, shows how close they were to the other Reformed Churches, in almost all points except Church government.

With the Restoration, Independents, Presbyterians and Separatists were all driven out into the wilderness. There, whether they liked it or not, they were all forced to become "Brownists" — that is, autonomous congregations separated completely from the State, and this pattern has dominated English nonconformity ever since. Nowadays many Congregationalists (and English Presbyterians too for that matter) glory in their independence from the State, perhaps not realising that to their forefathers it was not an achievement but a retreat.<sup>(49)</sup>

GEORGE YULE.

---

49. Even in the wilderness, Philip Nye argued for the rightful place of the national Church in his pamphlet *The Lawfulness of hearing the Public Ministers of the Church of England*. D. Nobbs: "Philip Nye on Church and State" in *Cambridge Historical Journal* 1935.

## Book Reviews

DIE ORDNUNG DER GEMEINDE (Zur dogmatischen Grundlegung des Kirchenrechts).

By Karl Barth (Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München), 1955, pp. 85; D.M. 3.90.

This little book is an extract from the 'Kirchliche Dogmatik' vol. IV/2 which was published in the same year by Evangelischer Verlag A. G., Zollikon-Zürich.

Karl Barth's treatment of the subject of church law will be of particular interest to those who have read Emil Brunner's work on 'The Misunderstanding of the Church' which was largely an emotive restatement of Rudolph Sohm's theory that the development of church law and order was a regrettable lapse from a state of spiritual purity in the primitive church. In contrast to this mistaken reading of the early Christian documents, Karl Barth recognises church law as a legitimate expression of the life of the Church and deals with it in a theologically responsible manner. This is an important contribution. But his treatment of the subject has its own difficulties. These are due to what has sometimes been called Barth's 'Christomonism' or, as he would prefer, to the dominant place which the notion of 'Christokratie' holds in his theology. This notion is responsible for his definition of the Church as a 'preliminary representation of the human race as sanctified in Jesus Christ,' which implies in its turn that the Church must furnish a pattern and example to the rest of mankind in and through the different manifestations of its own life, including its external legal organisation. The result is a rather unrealistic hope that church law will furnish an admittedly imperfect and frail criterion by which secular law will be induced to reform itself, if only in a hesitant and tentative manner. What layman, even within the Church, can as much as recount the steps of an ordinary Sunday service! What insuperable difficulties does the title of Moderator create to the imagination of a Scottish community, and yet Karl Barth expects church law to be a witness unto secular law! Is scepticism against this hope really nothing but 'peevish pessimism'?

As the reader will have gathered, this is a stimulating and thought-provoking statement of the subject.

H. H. REX.

### GENERAL REVELATION.

By G. C. Berkouwer (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1955, pp. 336; \$4.00.

As a reaction against the prevailing generalization of revelation there arose Barth's "Christomonism" which, in common with Thomism (though with differing evaluation), identifies general revelation and natural theology. In the contemporary situation Berkouwer challenges this identity of the ontic and noetic by accepting general revelation but rejecting natural theology. Here he closely follows Calvin who constantly speaks of created reality as a mirror in which God's glory is reflected, a glory which is no longer beheld by eyes which are blinded. A thousand things may occur round about a man in his sleep, but he is oblivious of them all. Thus the reality of revelation in creation and the knowledge of that revelation must be distinguished. The human concepts of God are formed not according to the clear representations God gives of Himself but by the invention of the presumptuous imaginations of man. Hence religion is not independent of revelation but rather a reaction against revelation based upon man's corrupted



natural knowledge of God. Closely associated with the discussion of the first chapter of Romans is that of the second, where, rejecting the Roman conception of natural law as based upon natural theology, Berkouwer upholds the conception of common grace the predominant aspect of which is not the goodness of human nature but the goodness of God's ordinances in preservation. In line with the prevailing thesis there are valuable expositions of the "Nature Psalms," the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Article 2 of the *Confessio Belgica*.

In present-day discussion "the pivotal question is whether we have the right to simply conclude from the exclusive salvation in Christ to the exclusive revelation in Christ" (p.93). Berkouwer in giving a negative answer is of course following in the tradition of Calvin rather than of Luther. But he constantly insists that in general revelation we are not dealing with an independent source of knowledge (a scripture *and* nature or a scripture *and* history comparable to scripture *and* tradition), but, on the contrary, faith in Jesus Christ looking through the spectacles of the Scriptures is of decisive significance for all reflection on general revelation in created reality. His position is summed up thus: "No one comes to the Father but by Christ, but neither to the understanding of the works of his hands. But in his light we see the light of creation" (p.134). From this standpoint the writer makes a vigorous attack on Barth's conception that there is no actual revelation of God in the cosmos but a 'hineinlesen' or 'hineininterpretieren,' the subjective insight of faith to which no creaturely reality corresponds. But the function of faith, it is affirmed, is receptive and never creative—"a perceptive, discerning function which sees reality, subjectively it is true, but always as the work of God" (p.327). Otherwise we are faced with a subjective view of creation in which man becomes a creator and God's revelation is obscured behind that of humanity. However, Berkouwer's conception of interpreted reality here would appear to be in conflict with his prevailing position in which he clearly distinguishes special revelation through the *Word* of God from general revelation through His *works*. Revelation must ultimately be not through the creature but God Himself—the *Word*. Hence the final meaning is found neither in faith nor the cosmos but the creative interpretative *Word*. And that surely is Barth's real position.

"There is no more significant question in the whole of theology and in the whole of human life than that of the nature and reality of revelation" (p. 17). This volume does not give the last answer to a crucial aspect of that question but it furnishes a useful and most provocative contribution to the continuing debate.

R. SWANTON.

## ETHICS.

By Dietrich Bonhoeffer (S.C.M., London), 1955, pp. 242; 21/-.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the author of this book, was a young German theologian of great promise who was a victim of the Nazi regime. Born in 1906, he began to teach theology at Berlin in 1930. In 1935 he was called by the Confessing Church to be leader of a Preachers' Seminary. His work for the Confessing Church and his close family contacts with the opposition to Hitler made him increasingly suspect and on the 5th April, 1943, he was arrested. Two years later he was hanged. Somewhere about 1937 Bonhoeffer was planning to write on the problems of Christian ethics. Between then and the time of his arrest he seems to have worked at it intermittently but the work was far from complete and the published volume is a compilation of the portions which have been preserved. Some of these are clearly only

first thoughts on the subject, sometimes hardly more than preliminary jottings. Other sections have obviously been worked over and some are in a finished state. This makes the task of the reviewer more than usually difficult. One's first reaction, on skimming through the book to get the main drift of it, is to question the wisdom of publishing a work so manifestly incomplete. Second thoughts, after a second, more careful, reading, revise that hasty judgment. The work is unfinished, many of the ideas expressed have not been thought through, and the terms used are often ambiguous and ill defined. But when all that has been said in criticism one must go on to say that this is a really stimulating book from which there is much to be learned.

Bonhoeffer's fundamental ethical convictions may be expressed negatively and positively by two quotations. Christian ethics differs entirely from all other ethical theory. "The knowledge of good and evil seems to be the aim of all ethical reflection. The first task of Christian ethics is to invalidate this knowledge. In launching this attack on the underlying assumptions of all other ethics . . . Christian ethics claims to discuss the origin of the whole problem of ethics, and thus professes to be a critique of all ethics simply as ethics" (p. 142). And the basis of Christian ethics is the reconciliation of the world to God in Jesus Christ whereby we are conformed to the likeness of Christ in the Church which is His Body. "The point of departure of Christian ethics is the body of Christ, the form of Christ in the form of the Church, and the formation of the Church in conformity with the form of Christ. . . . Jesus Christ is Himself the real man and consequently the foundation of all human reality" (pp. 21f).

Whether Bonhoeffer is successful in working out this thesis, whether, indeed, so radical a separation of Christian and non-Christian ethics is possible, is doubtful. But in the course of the discussion there are many fruitful insights and much stimulus to ethical thinking. The translation is excellent. JOHN HENDERSON.

#### ESSAYS PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

By Rudolf Bultmann (S.C.M. Press, London), 1955, pp. 337; 21/-.

It is greatly to be welcomed that the 'Essays Philosophical and Theological' have been made available to the English reader so soon after the publication of the translation of Bultmann's *N.T. Theology*. For Bultmann is a N.T. scholar who brings the mind of a systematic theologian to bear on his subject matter, and it is in these essays that the reader will find the keys to the understanding of the author's more technical works.

The Essays are a translation of the second volume of 'Glauben und Verstehen' published in 1952 as a supplementary volume to a similar collection of essays published under the same title in 1933. The German title does more justice to Bultmann's position than the English. The title 'Essays Philosophical and Theological' might create the impression that Bultmann belongs to that class of theologians who have a tendency to hive off into the field of philosophy. Such an impression is far from the truth. Bultmann is not another Troeltsch.

The two words, *Glauben* und *Verstehen*: To Believe and to Understand, describe Bultmann's position with admirable conciseness. The first points to the fact that Bultmann is firmly rooted in the tradition of the sixteenth century reformers; the other recalls the name of Schleiermacher and the whole subject of hermeneutics which Schleiermacher did so much to put on an entirely new footing.



These two facts combined sum up the central concern of Bultmann's theological contribution to our age: How to present the message of justification by faith in such a manner that men of this generation can understand it and as a result of it come to understand themselves rightly in their distinct human condition.

This question is tremendously serious to Bultmann, and he is determined to answer it with absolute intellectual honesty. His passion for truth has something of the pathos of Lessing, but unlike that eighteenth century thinker, he accepts the 'accidental historical truths' of the Bible records as the vehicle of the judging and redeeming Word of God. Admittedly, the concept of 'history' undergoes a change of meaning in this process, and much of the controversy over Bultmann is concerned with his use of the term 'history.' Doubtless, Bultmann operates with a reduced concept of history when he confines it to the individual's encounter with the Word of God in the present, laying an embargo on all attempts of discovering meaning in the collective history of the human race.

No matter whether the reader agrees with Bultmann or not, he will feel stimulated into a restlessness that will make him prepared to reconsider points of view which he took for granted.

The translator of these essays had a difficult task of which, on the whole, he has acquitted himself well. But why does he translate 'Glaube' with 'belief' when Bultmann quite obviously means 'Faith'? The English reader should know that for once the German original is more elegant and succinct in style than one would gather from the translation.

H. H. REX.

#### THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Rudolf Bultmann — translated by Kendrick Grobel (S.C.M. Press, London), Vol. II (1955), pp. 278; 25/-.

Like the first volume, this provides stimulating reading. It could be read as complete in itself, but numerous cross-references, especially in Part IV, make it desirable to have access to Volume I. There are the same virtues and the same faults as in the earlier volume: the exposition is often penetrating, provocative, helpful; but frequently it is disappointing and exasperating.

Part III consists of ninety pages given to the Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles. The historical position of John is first considered, and then the Johannine theology under the chapter headings of Johannine Dualism, The "Krisis" of the World, and Faith. Beginning with the acknowledgment that John's proclamation consists of the message of John 3:16 (p. 15), the discussion moves on to declare later that "the theme of the whole Gospel of John is the statement: 'The word became flesh' (1:14)" (p. 40). There is therefore something of an anti-climax when "it turns out in the end that Jesus as the Revealer of God *reveals nothing but that he is the Revealer*" (p. 66). What are we to make of a revelation that has no content? The importance of the assertion that the word "became flesh" has fallen by the wayside. Again, it may for some be reassuring to learn that the believer enjoys "eschatological existence"; but for most it will be cold comfort to find that this "existence" is "*not in any direct relationship to Jesus or to God*" (p. 85). (Italics in each of the above passages are as in the translation).

There is something too theoretical and unreal about this sort of thing, that makes it quite inadequate. Is it that, in spite of some fine and challenging insights, Bultman has missed or evaded the real

scandal of the Cross? At any rate, he has written a New Testament Theology—including (in Part IV) a long chapter on Christology and Soteriology—which sets aside the *person* of the historical Jesus as irrelevant. In “de-mythologising” the New Testament, he has de-historised the Gospel.

Part IV deals with The Development toward the Ancient Church. The rise of Church Order and its earliest development is considered; then the development of Doctrine, of which the core is Christology and Soteriology (see above); and, finally, the problem of Christian living. In all these chapters are to be found excellent things well said. But, although the fact is admitted and a reason is offered (p. 145), the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers are evoked far more frequently than might be expected in what is avowedly Theology of the New Testament. There is a resultant temptation to read back their motifs into the canonical writings.

A brief epilogue on the Task and the History of New Testament Theology brings the work to a close.

Thanks are due to the translator for making accessible the major work of a great scholar. This brief and inadequate review has aimed to suggest that it needs to be pondered with very careful discrimination, lest the reader finds himself wrongly orientated in his approach to the New Testament.

STEWART PETRIE.

#### LUTHER'S WORKS. Volume 12, SELECTED PSALMS I.

Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan (Concordia Publishing House, Saint Louis), 1955, pp. 418, \$5.

In his excellent Luther studies, *The Righteousness of God*, Dr. Gordon Rupp has told the interesting story of the surprisingly large number of translations of works of Luther published in England in the course of centuries. Some American translations might be added to that list. However, none of these earlier attempts to introduce Luther to the English speaking world can compete with what promises to be the future standard edition of Luther's works in English. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, and Muehlenberg Press, Philadelphia, have joined forces to bring out, within about 15 years, 55 volumes. Concordia, following the great tradition of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod—which published in the 19th century Luther's works in German on the basis of the Walch Edition with a vast amount of other sources of the history of the Reformation which otherwise are inaccessible (the original Walch Edition is to be found in the Public Library of Melbourne) will bring out 30 volumes of exegetical works under the competent editorship of Professor J. Pelikan, now at Chicago. Muehlenberg Press is to publish 24 volumes of other works, thus continuing the endeavours which have begun with the Philadelphia edition of *Selected Works of Luther* in English by Holman. The editor of these volumes will be Dr. H. T. Lehmann, also well equipped for this scholarly work. Both editors will be supported by a large staff of translators. The whole edition can be purchased at an extremely low price by way of a subscription which can be cancelled at any time. Taking in account the usual deduction for ministers, the price of the individual volume will not be much more than £A2.

The edition is based on the Weimar Edition (W.A.), that unique and unrepeatable critical edition of all of Luther's writings which was started in 1883 and is now being completed. The W.A. with its



constant improvements and additions will always remain the basis of Luther research. For the average theologian in the English speaking world, however, even Lutherans, it is, even if accessible, hardly readable, as far as the German text with its old orthography is concerned. Luther's German is, by the way, not as the General Introduction calls it, "Middle High German," but rather what is technically called "Early New High German," the first stage of modern German as it was created by Luther himself in his translation of the Bible. How difficult Luther's language sometimes is may be illustrated by the curious fact that still A. Smyth in his learned book *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (1926) speaks of "Suvermarianism" and "Suvermarians" as a sect in Germany. This is a misunderstanding of Luther's "Schwaermeri," a latinized form of "Schwaermer," which means the "enthusiasts" (this is a better translation than "fanatics" which occasionally is used still in this volume, following old Latin translations), the "Free Sprits," as R. Bainton calls them. The linguistic difficulties are sometimes so great that even German scholars have to consult, just as in the case of Zwingli's writings, special dictionaries. It would be a great help if each of the translators had on his desk at least A. Goetze's *Fruehneuhochdeutsches Glossar*. Since almost all of Luther's Latin Works have been translated into German, such translations may be consulted with great care. "Doctrina pietatis" (p. 197) is rendered with "doctrine of eternal salvation," probably because the older translations give the translation "Lehre de Gottseligkeit." But this latter word corresponds to "godliness" in the English Bible. This should not be understood as a pedantic criticism, but rather as a hint at the amazing difficulties the editors and translators will have to overcome. On the whole, the translation is admirable, especially those done by Prof. Pelican himself. Luther in a good idiomatic English without losing anything of what is characteristic of the German Reformer: this is, indeed, a great achievement.

While W.A. presents the writings of Luther in historical sequence, this edition returns to the practice of all older editions which arrange Luther's works according to subject matters. The readers of this Review will look forward with special interest to vols. 35-38 with the writings on "Word and Sacrament," and 39-41 on "Church and Ministry." The exegetical works are arranged in the sequence of the biblical books, thus furnishing the reader with a sort of commentary (for certain parts of the New Testament the sermons on the Gospels and Epistles must be added) on the Bible. This has the disadvantage that Luther's last lectures (on Genesis) which have been edited and somewhat melanchthonized by younger men precede the early lectures on Romans and Hebrews which show Luther's progress from mediæval theology to the rediscovery of the Gospel. However, just this way of presenting the material may help to overcome the modern exaggeration of the difference between the "young" and the "old" Luther. Despite the development he underwent as every great man, the Reformer has remained essentially the same. His *theologia crucis*, so often regarded as characteristic of the young or even of the pre-Reformation Luther, has still found perfect expression in his lectures in Genesis. When at the end of his life the first edition of his works was begun, he did not like the idea — a German professor who was absolutely free from vanity — stating that only two of his books were worth preserving: the Catechism and *De servo arbitrio*.

The present volume (12 in the series) contains expositions of Psalms 2, 8, 19, 23, 26, 45, 51 (from 1525-38) taken from several volumes of W.A., but contained in vol. V of the St. Louis Edition (Walch). Some are sermons, some lectures. The latter were based on the Latin text which the students had, while Luther gave his Latin explanation on the basis of the Hebrew text and correcting the Vulgate constantly. Time and again he admonished his students to learn Hebrew<sup>(1)</sup> which for him was always more important than Greek, just as the "Scripture" proper was for him, as for Jesus and the Apostles, the Old Testament, read, of course, in the light of the Gospel. This distinguishes him from Zwingli and other Reformers of Humanist background. In his exegesis first a line from the Vulgate text was read. It is always used as sub-title. In cases when these sub-titles, as taken from the Vulgate, differ from Luther's own understanding of the Hebrew text (p.198), they should be given in quotation marks. More notes might be useful, and those taken from the W.A. should be examined. Other suggestions for an improvement will be made directly to the editors. On the whole it must be said that the present volume gives to the English reader an impression of the amazing work done by one of the greatest exegetes of Christendom. Even where we cannot accept the details of Luther's interpretation Luther can teach us what all Churches of Christendom, and especially all preachers, have to learn after so much damage has been done by a mere historical approach to Scripture: a real *theological* understanding of the Bible as the Word of God and the book of the Church. Space does not allow to give some examples of the rich contents of this volume. We can only suggest that the exposition of Psalm 2 or the powerful interpretation of the "Miserere" may be read as specimens.

The publishers as well as the editors deserve not only our gratitude, but also encouragement of the great task that lies still before them. Not only the Lutheran Churches will profit from their work, but, as we hope, the whole of English speaking Christendom. For a man like Luther belongs to the entire Church of Christ.

H. SASSE.

#### THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING OF THE CROSS.

By Leon Morris (London, The Tyndale Press), 1955, pp. 296; 15/-.

How far is the idea of substitution present in the N.T. doctrine of the death of Christ? It is well-known that some modern writers have rejected the idea. Dr. Morris here examines six conceptions which are germane to the N.T. presentation of Christ's death, with a view to discovering what substitutionary element, if any, they contain. The six words are: redemption, covenant, the blood, propitiation, reconciliation and justification. The result is a most rewarding study of the Atonement much wider in scope than the specific object of inquiry would suggest. Dr. Morris concludes that substitution, while not directly

1. We quote an example: "I have often advised you to learn the Hebrew language and not to neglect it so. For even if this language were useless otherwise, one should learn it out of thankfulness. It is a part of religion and divine worship to teach or learn the language through which alone we can learn anything at all of the divine. In it we hear God speak, we hear how the saints call upon God to achieve the mightiest deeds; thus study toward learning this language might rightly be called a kind of a Mass or divine service. . . There is a danger that God may be offended by this ingratitude and deprive us not only of the knowledge of this sacred language, but of Greek, Latin and all religion." (ad Psalm 45,1; p. 198f.)



present in all the concepts he examines, occupies a definite place in N.T. thought on the significance of Christ's death.

Dr. Morris adopts the lexicographical method with which we are familiar these days through such works as Kittel's *Wörterbuch*. Dr. Morris submits to the discipline in scholarly fashion and finds that the peaceable fruits of sound theology are yielded by the exercise. In addition, the opinions of many modern writers are passed under critical review, which gives the book an added relevance in the present discussion of the subject.

"Redemption" is shown to involve the payment of a price, which, where the Atonement is concerned, implies a substitutionary process. "Covenant" does not directly imply substitution. This is a useful chapter, stressing the unilateral character of God's covenants: they are *diathekai*, not *sunthekai*, as the LXX translators realized. (One wonders if Dr. Morris is justified in assuming that covenants were always made by dividing animals in pieces "throughout all those centuries" between Abraham and Jeremiah, p. 65. Also, there seems to be a confusion on p. 66 between the covenant made with Noah for his deliverance from the flood in Gen. 6:8, and the covenant made with all flesh for their preservation "while the earth remaineth" in Gen. 9:9.) "The blood" is shown to signify death, i.e. 'life cut off' rather than 'life released.'

Perhaps the most important section, from the point of view of present-day theology, is that on "propitiation." Here, Dr. Morris systematically (and, in the reviewer's opinion, conclusively) demolishes the view put forward by C. H. Dodd that "wrath" is not to be attributed to God in the N.T. and that expiation rather than propitiation is the correct idea behind *hilasterion* and *hilasmos*. We have a monument to Dr. Dodd's prestige in the A.R.S.V. rendering of Romans 3:25, I John 2:2 and 4:10, but anyone who has taken the trouble to check Dodd's references (in *The Bible and the Greeks*) or to consult a concordance knows how ill-based his contentions are. May we hope that Dr. Morris has given us the definitive refutation of the 'no wrath—no propitiation' school.

Those who hold firmly to the objective character of the Atonement and to the substitutionary character of Christ's sacrifice will find strength for their convictions in this fine linguistic and exegetical study.

DONALD ROBINSON.

#### ERNIEDRIGUNG UND ERHOEHUNG BEI JESUS UND SEINEN NACHFOLGERN.

By Eduard Schweizer (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich), 1955, pp. 167; Fr. 15.50.

The reader without a knowledge of the German language has an opportunity of acquainting himself with the central thesis of this book in a recent article by the same author which appeared in the *New Testament Studies* (vol. 2, no. 2: Nov. 1955) under the title of 'Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church.'

Eduard Schweizer (Zürich) has set himself the task of tracing a line of thought in the N.T. which is dominated by the pattern of discipleship in terms of lordship and following. This is, however, not a revival of Karl Heim's dubious christology of lordship in terms of leadership! When Schweizer singles out this line of thought for study, he recognises that this is neither the sole nor the most important theme in N.T. Christology. He does so merely for the reason

that he believes that our contemporaries are burdened by a sense of anguish and futility rather than an overwhelming sense of guilt. He believes the Christ who is 'with us' will appeal to them more readily than the Christ who is 'for us.'

The author undertakes to show that the Christ who is 'with us' is the dominant theme in the christology of the Hellenistic Church as it is reflected in the early creedal formulations which extend to a time prior to the work of St. Paul. As an outstanding example he quotes the pre-Pauline (Lohmeyer!) creed (or baptismal hymn) in Ph. 2:6-11 where the theme of Christ's humiliation and exaltation is characteristically linked with the notion of discipleship. 'Die grosse Vorbild-Stelle,' as Gustaf Wingren has called it!

Hellenistic as this passage is in its emphasis on Christ's cosmic rule (cp. 1 Ti. 3:16), it yet reflects according to Schweizer the old christology of the Palestinian Church itself according to which the resurrection of Jesus was originally quite simply the divine Yes to his obedience to God and in which Jesus' death had no significance apart from this obedience. The root of this christology the author discovers in the traditional Jewish concept of the righteous servant which carries with it not only the notion of suffering but of vicarious suffering as well.

With that the transition is furnished from a christology of discipleship, originally, of the earthly Lord (synoptic gospels) and then (Jo., Hb.) of the exalted Lord to a christology of atonement as it is reflected in the equally early creed of 1 Cor. 15:3. For once Schweizer has stressed the 'with us' in N.T. Christology he does not hesitate to come down emphatically on the 'for us.' This would naturally lead on to a study of St. Paul which is, however, absent from the present book, since the author confines himself to an analysis of the relevant passages in the synoptic gospels, the Gospel of John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, adding from the Pauline epistles only what can be counted the common property of the Hellenistic Church. In the above mentioned article in N.T. Studies, the author has, however, promised us a treatment of this subject in his forthcoming article on the word 'pneuma' in Kittels Theol. Wörterbuch. It is with real interest that we are looking forward to that article since it will supplement the author's thesis in its present form.

In the present book, Schweizer has presented familiar material from a less familiar angle, and this has proved most stimulating. Unfortunately, lack of space does not permit the reviewer to do justice to the wealth of detailed arguments which are incorporated in this study. The book can be highly recommended to the reader.

H. H. REX.

#### **HISTORY OF THE WORLD'S ALLIANCE OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS.**

By Clarence Prouty Shedd and Other Contributors (S.P.C.K., London), 1955, pp. 746; 27/6.

This work is a prodigious achievement. Its compilation reflects great credit upon its distinguished Editor, Professor C. P. Shedd, of Yale University, who spent three years gathering and collating the material. He was assisted in his labours by an able body of international scholars. The work covers in detail the early origins of the Y.M.C.A. There is a discussion of the indigenous movements dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries which fertilised the new growth.

The arresting thing is the manner in which small groups of evangelical Christians banded themselves together for prayer, Bible study, and witness. It was from these small groups of likeminded men in Germany, Switzerland, France and England that the World's Alliance eventually developed. The original Y.M.C.A. was composed of men who were unashamed and active evangelicals. The movement was limited to men who were able to make a confession of faith, and who were willing to dedicate themselves to the task of evangelism.

It was a decisive step when it was resolved to make the infant society, not only a fellowship of Christian men, but also an agency for educational and social purposes. The inception coincided with the eager and insatiable demand for knowledge which characterised the 1840's: the period that saw the establishment of Mechanics and Working Men's Institutes. The rapid growth of the movement in the early days cannot be divorced from the decision to provide public lectures of an educational kind: and it is a question to what extent this development deflected the organisation into quite new and different and unexpected channels. It is not unfair to say that the movement to-day is better known for its educational work than for its evangelism. Nevertheless it would be wrong to minimise the extent to which the faith of successive leaders has continued to inspire the activities of the Alliance. Again and again it is reiterated that "love for youth and faith in God as revealed in Jesus Christ has been the motive power of the Y.M.C.A." (p. 462). This volume reveals something of the tensions and problems which resulted as the Movement spread into predominantly Roman Catholic and Orthodox lands. Those concerned with ecumenical relationships will find here material for weighty and sober reflection.

This volume has its own intrinsic interest — it is a factual and an historical study of many significant developments (and the documentation is remarkably thorough) — but it has also a wider interest — as a record of the problems and perplexities that are inseparable from the realm of interconfessional relationships.

S. BARTON BABBAGE.

#### NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

By Ethelbert Stauffer (S.C.M. Press, London), 1955, pp. 373; 25/-.

This volume consists of three parts: a brief section of eight essays (48 pages) upon the development of primitive Christian theology: the central and most substantial section (175 pages with 70 pages of notes) on "the Christocentric theology of history in the N.T."; a final section of 20 pages on the creeds of the primitive Church. In addition we have seven Appendices giving material with which to check the author's methods and conclusions at a number of points. The author "has striven for the brevity of Tacitus in print, and the precision of a mathematician in thought." The epigrammatic style is most thought-provoking; but the wise reader will gain most if he has a pencil and notebook, and the relevant texts open before him. It is one of those rare books which can be read both quickly and slowly, with different kinds of profit.

Three interrelated questions suggest themselves: (1) Is the structure of thought in the central section (Creation and Fall, Law and Promise, the Coming of Christ, the Church and the World, the Present and the Future) suggested by a formal scheme derived from some other source than the N.T. itself? It is roughly the scheme of the arrangement of



the books of the Bible. Does it arise in that order out of the contents of the N.T. message? Is it Christocentric enough? (2) Does pre-occupation with the structure of relations inside the early Church not sometimes lead to exaggerations, e.g., on the role of Peter? (For a positive correction cf. Cullmann.) (3) Are the inadequate handling of the Spirit and an absence of any treatment of love signs that a proper concern for the structure of Christian thought stands in need of a supplementary account of the quality of the new relationship between God and man in the fellowship of the Church? Nevertheless, a standard work this for the study of N.T. theology for many years to come.

J. D. McCAUGHEY.

#### SHORTER NOTICES.

*Die Verkündigung des Evangeliums und die Politische Existenz*, by H. J. Iwand, W. Kreck and K. G. Steck (Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munich, D.M. 2.50). This issue of *Theologische Existenz Heute* (No. 41) contains three lectures by outstanding German theologians read to a conference of ministers presided over by Martin Niemöller. Immediately one recognizes the old fighting spirit of the German Confessing Church, which so gallantly resisted the Nazi ideology. The endeavour of a group of German church leaders and theologians in attempting to find their Christian position, in a world where the old demons of nationalism and paganism have not at all died, is heart-warming. H. J. Iwand mentions a number of these demons: the false doctrine of the autonomy of the state (initiated by Luther and Melancthon in their division of law and gospel—the easy division); friend-enemy; antisemitism; the disregard for the lessons of the past, and, finally, our unbelief in the arms of the spirit. W. Kreck compares in six theses the message of the gospel with the characteristics of the average ideology. This is a very important study. K. G. Steck investigates what the fundamental elements in the gospel are for our political ethics of to-day. Christendom should become aware of the necessity of a united effort in this respect. We need one concentrated study, the growth of one tradition regarding the political problems of our world.

M. W. J. Geursen.

*The Teachers' Commentary*, completely revised edition, ed. by Henton Davies and Alan Richardson (S.C.M., 21/-) contains several excellent new articles and summary comments, as well as some which have properly survived from the previous editions (e.g., Wheeler Robinson on "The Theology of the O.T."). Teachers in day school and Sunday school will be well equipped with this volume, with its valuable bibliographies to lead them further. Few serious students but will find illumination and suggestion from its pages: e.g., Snaith on the Psalms, Cranfield on the Fourth Gospel, Grayston on the Pauline letters, and the contributions of the editors here and there throughout the volume. Here we have a useful summary, presented in fairly simple terms, of how a representative group of (on the whole younger) British scholars are interpreting the Bible to-day.

J. D. McCaughey.

*A New Testament Wordbook*, by William Barclay (S.C.M., 7/6). This "attempt to make the results of linguistic scholarship available for the ordinary reader of the New Testament" is singularly successful, and the reader will be hard to please who does not share the enthusiasm by Shaun Herron in his Foreword. The studies first appeared in the columns of the *British Weekly*, and the present book was made in response to numerous pleas for their more permanent form. Their popularity is readily understood. For the author brings to his task not only a wide knowledge of Classical and Hellenistic Greek, but also the rarer ability to relate his knowledge to the New Testament in

simple terms with a lively awareness of practical implications. The meanings of the words are displayed against their own living background, and then there is indicated their relevance for to-day. Rewarding fare is offered for all kinds of readers, while preachers will find seed thoughts of special value.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, by William Neil, and *The Epistle to the Romans*, by A. M. Hunter, The Torch Bible Commentaries (S.C.M., each 8/6). The limitations of this series, which necessarily often involve an over-simplification of issues, impose a severe test upon the writers who have been entrusted with the exposition of two Epistles so profound as these. Each has faced and met the test by a slightly different method of presenting the commentary. It is perhaps surprising that the commentary on Romans is the shorter of the two. Besides the usual matters of Introduction, each includes a short section on the relevance of the Epistle for to-day, and throughout each commentary its message is applied to modern questions. Dr. Neil expresses a special indebtedness to Professor William Manson, and follows his recent suggestion that Hebrews was written to advance the world-mission of Christianity pioneered by Stephen, being an appeal to men who had distorted that mission by their Jewish exclusiveness. He would bring it into association with the twentieth century ecumenical movement. Dr. Neil gives a running commentary on the Epistle paragraph by paragraph, breaking off as necessary for the explication of particular verses or phrases. He seeks to overcome the seeming remoteness of his author's thought for present-day readers, and as he guides them with illuminating comment, he shows that it still has a message of special importance. Professor Hunter, whose commentary on St. Mark's Gospel inaugurated this series, prefaces each chapter of the Epistle with a modern paraphrase that greatly assists the reader when the argument is difficult to follow, and he deals separately with rather more single words and phrases. In his Introduction he points out that, although Romans may be the most important Christian letter ever written, yet for a number of reasons, first of which undoubtedly is that it makes formidable reading, there is a reluctance among Christians nowadays to read it. It may be said that this little commentary should do much to overcome that reluctance; for it makes the reader aware of the interest and the importance and the relevance of Paul for to-day, and should spur him on to deeper study.

C. S. Petrie.

*Israel and the New Covenant*, by Roderick Campbell (The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, \$3.75). The thesis of this book is that the Gospel dispensation is the fulfilment of Old Testament promises and prophecies and that the Christian Church is the present Israel of God. The author seeks to establish this position by a collation and exposition of relevant Scripture passages and quotations from orthodox scholars of the past. The expositions are clear though diffusive. The quotations, as well as throwing light upon the theme, reveal that the position taken is no novel one. Indeed, it is the one which has generally prevailed in Reformed theology. Those familiar with this school will find little new here. However, it is well that the position should be restated, in view of the fact that some would deny to the Christians "the promises made to the fathers." It is also important to relate these Scriptures to the contemporary scene. This Mr. Campbell does both in the social sphere and in regard to missionary enterprise. He rightly feels that a true understanding of the Word of God in regard to these matters would cleanse and sanctify social, commercial and national life and give new impetus and encouragement

to the great task of the Church-world evangelization, the nerve of which, he claims, has been cut by a false view of the place of the Church in the Divine economy. Thus this book is no abstract theorising; it has a practical thrust. It is refreshing to read such a strong emphasis upon Covenant theology—a key which unlocks a great deal of Scripture. The author rightly makes much of the present position and privileges—and also responsibilities of the Christian as heir of the Covenants. However, he seems largely to ignore the future blessedness which still awaits believers in the eternal state after Christ's Second Advent, to which, surely, some of the prophecies in both the Old and New Testament point.

*Matthew Twenty Four and Revelation Twenty*, by Marcellus Kik (The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., \$1.50 and \$2.00). The author, a minister of the Reformed Church, U.S.A., finds the key to Matthew 24 in verse 34, and interprets the previous verses as applying to the destruction of Jerusalem—except verse 27, where the Second Advent is placed in contrast to this more immediate and local event. The succeeding verses he holds to refer to the end of time. He regards Revelation 20 as a highly figurative panorama of history from the first to the second coming of Christ. Characterised by sound scholarship, careful exegesis and clear presentation, both books are a helpful contribution to present-day eschatological discussion.

W. R. McEwen.

*The Flood and Noah's Ark and The Tower of Babel*, by Andre Parrot, translated by Edwin Hudson (S.C.M., 7/6 each). It is somewhat a pity that the "Studies in Biblical Archaeology" should make their debut with two of the least satisfactory volumes. They are well bound and printed, being quite superior to their French originals in this respect, but they cannot be regarded as giving a fair and authoritative presentation of their subjects. The author has interesting and helpful ideas, but does not always distinguish between fact and opinion. He states categorically that the tower of Babel was a Ziggurat. Perhaps it was, but this is merely a theory. In connection with the flood narrative of Genesis, Parrot makes the astounding and quite erroneous statement that "exegetical criticism has conclusively demonstrated—and this is admitted by all the experts without exception . . . that the narrative of Gen. 6-8 is in reality the fusion of two accounts, closely interwoven, one of which (J=Jahvistic) dates from the eighth century B.C., the other (P=Priestly) dating at the earliest from the sixth century B.C." (p. 15). This is not admitted by all the experts (see A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, p. 245 ff.). Nevertheless, despite a few blemishes of this type, these books are packed with good things, the plates and diagrams, and indeed the translation being of a high order. Parrot's analysis of the archaeological evidence for the flood is careful (though brief), and his conclusion reasonable, i.e., that the Flood of the Bible was one of the many floods, more memorable because of its greater devastation. His evidence for the tower of Babel is, of course, really evidence for Mesopotamian ziggurats. Good bibliographies are provided.

*Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch*, by W. J. Martin (Tyndale, 1/6). This monograph will prove of fairly wide interest, being an attempt to demonstrate that the literary criticism of the O.T., especially the Pentateuch, if it is to be of permanent value, must become a science requiring judgment according to an objective linguistic methodology, and not continue to be, as it has been for too long, a subtle art requiring imagination. The author (Rankin Lecturer in Hebrew and Ancient Semitic languages in the University of Liver-



pool), bases his lecture on a telling comparison of Pentateuchal criticism with the Homeric question, and then analyses the stylistic evidence for composite authorship of the Pentateuch, concluding that "there would seem to exist no valid objection to accepting Genesis as a literary unit, the work of a single author.

*Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, by D. W. Gooding (Tyndale, 1/6). Although they will be few who read this study with understanding, it is good that the Tyndale Press should embark on the publication of specialized research of this quality. The lecture suffers grievously from being almost devoid of properly annotated references, and a table of MSS, especially the minuscules, would have proved useful. The author holds the position of Research Assistant in the University of Durham.

R. F. Hosking.

*Danish Rebel*, by Johannes Knudsen (Muhlenberg, \$3.50). The discovery of another Danish rebel, Soren Kierkegaard, has drawn attention through his many polemical or derisive remarks to his older contemporary, N. F. S. Grundtvig (1783-1872). Both were in revolt against the rationalistic Protestantism of their day, but whereas the introvert, Kierkegaard, reached the conclusion that the category of the Church must be negated in the interest of "New Testament Christianity," the extrovert Grundtvig, made primary the corporate confession of the living Church which is an inseparable element of baptism. This emphasis had a parallel in his views on popular education which inspired the Folk Schools of Denmark, "the most spectacular fruit of his labours." Distinguished for his studies in ancient Nordic history and mythology ("the first and greatest of Beowulf scholars"), Grundtvig was also the Charles Wesley of his country, compiling over 2,000 hymns of which 200 are in the official Danish Hymnal. This volume provides an illuminating introduction to the life and work of "the great hymn writer, the national poet and historian, the greatest renewer of Danish Church life, and the most distinctive pedagogue of the nineteenth century" (Henning Hoirup).

*The Five Books of Moses and The Unity of Isaiah*, by Oswald T. Allis (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, \$3.75 and \$2.25). The first edition of the former volume, to which this second edition adds a short section on more recent developments with a special reference to Dialectical theology, was reviewed at length in our May 1944 issue, where it was described "as a reasoned account of how we can be scientific and up-to-date, and yet still believe that the law was given by Moses." The English edition of the latter volume, reviewed in our July 1952 issue, was referred to as "a refreshing treatment of an old topic."

R. Swanton.

*The Presbyterian Faith*, by R. Swanton (The Hawthorn Session, 317 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, E.2, Vic., 1/-). This booklet reproduces four sermons by its author. The first, "Our Doctrine," states the Australian Church's relationship to Scripture and the constitutional position of the Confession of Faith and the Declaratory Statement. Then follows "Our Order" and "Our Worship." The latter discusses such topics as the position of the pulpit and infrequent communion. The final sermon, "Christian Unity," is based upon the text, "The Church, which is His body." There is an Introduction by Professor D. S. Hopkirk.

F. M. Bradshaw.



# Book Reviews

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| BARTH, KARL: Die Ordnung Gemeinde .. .. .   | 50   |
| By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.                     |      |
| BERKOUWER, G. C.: General Revelation .. .. .  | 50   |
| By the Rev. R. Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.  |      |
| BONHOEFFER, DIETRICH: Ethics .. .. .  | 51   |
| By the Rev. Professor John Henderson, M.A., Ph.D., Knox College, University of Otago.                   |      |
| BULTMANN, RUDOLF: Essays Philosophical and Theological  | 52   |
| By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex.  |      |
| BULTMANN, RUDOLF: Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II  | 53   |
| By the Rev. C. S. Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Vic.   |      |
| LUTHER'S WORKS: Vol. 12, Selected Psalms I. Ed. by Jaroslav Pelikan .. .. .                             | 54   |
| By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.                 |      |
| MORRIS, LEON: The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross ..   | 56   |
| By the Rev. Donald Robinson, M.A., Moore College, Sydney.   |      |
| SCHWEIZER, EDUARD: Erniedering und Erhoehung bei Jesu und seinen Nachfolgern .. .. .                    | 57   |
| By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex.  |      |
| SHEDD, C. P., AND OTHERS: History of the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations .. .. . | 58   |
| By the Very Rev. Principal S. Barton Babbage, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Ridley College, Melbourne.            |      |
| STAUFFER, ETHELBERT: New Testament Theology .. ..   | 59   |
| By the Rev. Professor J. D. McCaughey, M.A., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.                   |      |
| SHORTER NOTICES .. .. .   | 60   |



